

and submit reports to Congress on war-time contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan. He cited a provision that enhances the protections from reprisal for contractor employees who disclose evidence of waste, fraud or abuse on Department of Defense contracts. He objected—or at least raised a question—about a requirement for offices within the intelligence community to respond to written requests from the chairman or ranking member of the Armed Services Committees for intelligence assessments, reports, estimates or legal opinions within 45 days, unless the President asserts a privilege pursuant to the Constitution of the United States; and he also made reference to at least a limitation on the use of funds appropriated pursuant to the act to establish a military base or installation for the permanent stationing of U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise U.S. control of the oil resources of Iraq.

Now, I understand the President's statement did not say these specific provisions or any other provisions of the act are unlawful, nor that the executive branch would not implement these provisions. I also understand similar statements have been included in signing statements on a number of laws by this President and that those statements did not result in the refusal to enforce the law as written.

Nevertheless, I believe it is important to come to the floor as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to express the view that Congress has a right to expect the administration will faithfully implement all the provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008—not just the ones the President happens to agree with.

As I noted at the outset, the President vetoed an earlier version of this act which contained the same specific provisions he singled out in his signing statement yesterday. The President did not choose to exercise his veto over those provisions and, as a result, they have not changed in any way whatsoever in the version of the bill the President chose to sign. With his signature, these provisions become the law of the land. Congress and the American people have a right to expect the administration will now faithfully carry them out.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 90 minutes, with the time equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, is it in order for me to make a comment as in morning business at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 433 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISA

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk for a minute about the pending FISA legislation.

As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I have been very pleased to be a part of the bipartisan process in which Chairman ROCKEFELLER and Vice Chairman BOND have crafted a very delicate, a very sensitive, yet important piece of legislation. Probably the most important piece of legislation that the Intelligence Committee has dealt with over the last several months or even years. Certainly, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come to the floor of this body this year.

This FISA legislation gives tools to our intelligence community which allow our brave men and women—who stand at the forefront today of the war on terrorism in every part of the world—to gather information from those who are plotting, planning, and scheming to kill and harm Americans. The tools with which the intelligence community seeks to get in this particular instance deal with their ability to gather information, primarily through what we refer to as electronic surveillance, from terrorists, or bad guys, who are overseas communicating to other individuals who are also overseas. There is no question that in order for our intelligence or law enforcement officials to be able to gather information from communications of persons located within the United States, it is necessary that they first obtain a court order. Let's make that very clear. We

must first obtain a court order to conduct surveillance against individuals located within the United States. What we are seeking to do in this legislation is to give our intelligence community the ability to collect information without a court order from people who are planning attacks against the United States and located outside the United States. It is those individuals whom we seek to gather information from and prohibit from having the capability to kill and harm Americans. This legislation is a crucial piece in the puzzle to enable the intelligence community to gather information from these individuals.

This particular piece of legislation has been debated in the Intelligence Committee for 10 months and was voted out of the Intelligence Committee on a very bipartisan vote of 13 to 2. I actually voted against several of the amendments offered in the Intelligence Committee. But at the end of the day, even though some of the amendments I voted against were accepted and were included in the bill, I believed it was such an important piece of legislation and put such necessary power and authority into the hands of the intelligence community that I voted to support it.

I commend my vice chairman, Senator BOND, who is on the floor with me now, for his leadership. I would simply ask the vice chairman: We started debate on this bill on the Senate floor in December, have been debating this bill this week, as well as last week. Where are we? What is the holdup in passing this critical legislation? What is the problem? Why can't the Senate give our intelligence community the tools they need to protect Americans?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, if I may respond to my colleague from Georgia, who is a very valuable member of the Intelligence Committee and who brings expertise from the other body and who has been a valuable contributor, when we passed the FISA bill in what is called the Protect America Act in August, everybody agreed that it should be 60 votes because this is a very important but very controversial bill that has to be adopted by 60 votes. Thus, we have asked that amendments to this bill be considered under a 60-vote rule.

It is very common in this Senate to demand 60 votes to be sure it is a non-partisan bill. So far, we have not been able—although we have provided several alternatives to our friends on the other side—to get a clear way of going forward. So that is why we are stuck, waiting to find a reasonable manner of proceeding.

I would ask my colleague if, in fact, he feels we had adequate contact with, interaction, and advice from the intelligence community and whether it is important to have the advice and assistance of those who are experts in and know the operations of electronic surveillance, to have a role in our drafting of the legislation.